

REMARKS

Introductory Comments:

Claims 26-45 were examined in the Office Action under reply. Claims 30-45 were indicated as allowed. Claim 29 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claims 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). This rejection is believed to be overcome as discussed more fully below.

Overview of the Above Amendments:

Claims 28 and 29 have been canceled and the recitations therefrom added to claim 26. Thus, claim 26 now effectively corresponds to canceled claim 29. Claim 45 has been amended to correct minor typographical errors.

The specification has also been amended to correct obvious typographical errors at page 6, line 18 and page 11, line 8. In this regard, “100 mm” has been corrected to read “100 µm” at page 6. It is readily apparent that 100 µm was indeed intended based on the knowledge in the art that the epidermal layer is between 50 and 100 µm thick. See, page 5, line 6. Similarly, the specification has been amended at page 11 to correct an obvious numbering error.

The foregoing amendments are made without prejudice, without intent to abandon any originally claimed subject matter, and without intent to acquiesce in any rejection of record. Applicant expressly reserves the right to file one or more continuing applications hereof containing the canceled or unamended claims.

Rejections Over the Art:

Claims 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,749,376 to Wilk et al. Claim 28 has been canceled. Solely in an effort to advance prosecution, claim 26 has been rewritten to incorporate all of the limitations from claim 29. Claim 29 was considered allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim (claim 26) and any intervening claims (claim 28). Thus, claim 26 now corresponds to

Atty Dkt No. 4000-0001.01
USSN: 10/767,359
PATENT

claim 29, which claim was considered allowable. The remaining rejected claim, namely claim 27, depends from allowable claim 26. Thus, this basis for rejection has been overcome and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are patentable. Accordingly, allowance is believed to be in order and an early notification to that effect would be appreciated. If the Examiner notes any further matters which she believes may be expedited by a telephone interview, she is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (650) 493-3400.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/19/05

By:
Roberta L. Robins
Registration No. 33,208

ROBINS & PASTERNAKL LLP
1731 Embarcadero Road, Suite 230
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: 650-493-3400
Facsimile: 650-493-3440